## **PUBLIC SUBMISSION**

**As of:** September 28, 2015 **Received:** September 21, 2015

**Status:** Pending\_Post

**Tracking No.** 1jz-8197-fxdy

Comments Due: September 24, 2015

**Submission Type:** Web

**Docket:** EBSA-2010-0050

Definition of the Term "Fiduciary"; Conflict of Interest Rule—Retirement Investment Advice; Notice of proposed rulemaking and withdrawal of previous proposed rule.

Comment On: EBSA-2010-0050-0204

Definition of the Term Fiduciary; Conflict of Interest Rule- Retirement Investment Advice

**Document:** EBSA-2010-0050-DRAFT-5825

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-08831

## **Submitter Information**

Name: Anonymous Anonymous

## **General Comment**

I understand the desire to make the investment process safer and clearer for the average participant. However, there are many uses of options which are not speculative, help generate safe additional returns and can be seen as beneficial for users in IRAs and similar retirement accounts. Any limitations on brokerage firms providing access to options trades and education is shortsighted and unfairly takes flexibility away from many users.

If you feel the need to strengthen the requirements for vetting investors who wish to use options, so be it, but don't take away this tool for many users by putting onerous requirements and/or the threat of penalties for firms allowing the use of options in retirement accounts.

You can't constantly dumb down everything to the lowest common denominator in the interest of safety, there has to be individual responsibility in the world.